UNITED STATES DISTRICT C SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NE	W YORK	X
COURTALERT.COM, INC.		: :
- against -	Plaintiff,	: 20-CV-7739 (VSB) (VF)
AMERICAN LEGALNET, INC. EREZ BUSTAN, and ROBERT	•	ORDER
	Defendants.	
ROBERT LOEB,		: :
	Third-Party Plaintiff,	: : :
- against -		· :
YANIV SCHILLER,		: :
	Third-Party Defendants.	

VERNON S. BRODERICK, United States District Judge:

Before me is Defendants' objection, (Doc. 124), to Magistrate Judge Figueredo's October 17, 2024 order denying Defendants' request for Plaintiff to provide a detailed computation of damages, (Doc. 120). Also before me is Plaintiff's opposition to the objection. (Doc. 138.)

The objection is DENIED AS MOOT. Defendants seek an order compelling "Plaintiff to provide proper initial disclosures as to damages and related responses to damages interrogatories." (Doc. 124 at 1.) On November 27, 2024, however, Defendants submitted a letter representing that Plaintiff has "committed to amending their responses to their Initial Disclosures on damages and certain interrogatories [] within four weeks of" Defendants'

production of certain discovery, which is now complete. (Doc. 141.) Since Plaintiff has

committed to amend its initial disclosures and interrogatories to provide the information

Defendants seek in their objection, an order on the objection would be superfluous at this time.

Plaintiff should nonetheless be mindful of Rule 26(a)'s ongoing obligation for a party

seeking damages to supplement the initial disclosures with further and more detailed disclosures

as "additional information is obtained." 8A Fed. Prac. & Proc. Civ. § 2053 (3d ed. June 2024

update); see Design Strategy, Inc. v. Davis, 469 F.3d 284, 296 (2d Cir. 2006) (explaining that "the

rule imposes a burden of disclosure that includes the functional equivalent of a standing Request

for Production under Rule 34" (quoting 1993 advisory committee notes to Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a))).

In accordance with the order of reference, (Doc. 46), Defendants should address any

future discovery-related motions to Judge Figueredo in the first instance.

Accordingly, it is hereby:

ORDERED that Defendants' objection to Magistrate Judge Figueredo's order is DENIED

AS MOOT.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: December 12, 2024

New York, New York

United States District Judge

2